

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA SAN FRANCISCO DIVISION

United States of America,)	Case No. CR 15-361 WHA
Plaintiff,) v.)	STIPULATED ORDER EXCLUDING TIME UNDER THE SPEEDY TRIAL ACT
Arvin Angara	FILED
Defendant.)	AUG 10 2015 BICHARD W. WIEKING
For the reasons stated by the parties on the record on August 10, 2015, the Court exchanges considering speedy Trial Act from August 10, 2015 to September 1, 2015 and finds that the ends of justice served by the continuance outweight he best interest of the public and the defendant in a speedy trial. See 18 U.S.C. § 161(h)(7)(A). The Court makes this finding and bases this continuance on the following factor(s):	
Failure to grant a continuance would be li See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(i).	kely to result in a miscarriage of justice.
defendants, the nature of the prosect according to the prosect ac	to [check applicable reasons] the number of cution, or the existence of novel questions of fact lequate preparation for pretrial proceedings or the trial this section. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(ii).
	the defendant reasonable time to obtain counsel, igence. See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).
Failure to grant a continuance would unre counsel's other scheduled case commitmed See 18 U.S.C. § 3161(h)(7)(B)(iv).	asonably deny the defendant continuity of counsel, given ents, taking into account the exercise of due diligence.
	asonably deny the defendant the reasonable time into account the exercise of due diligence.
IT IS SO ORDERED. DATED: 6/0/15	JOSEPH S. SPERO United States Chief Magistrate Judge
STIPULATED: Attorney for Defendant	Assistant United States Attorney